

Dear FCC,

Within a month of satellite radio's rollout in San Diego, hilly home of notoriously bad reception, we had three receivers. We have just returned from a relaxing, week-long camping trip in the beautiful Lake Tahoe Sierra mountains, throughout which we enjoyed clear, crisp reception on our XM satellite radio, even at remote campgrounds. Impossible with local FM or AM!

On the way home, we checked LA traffic on XM's new instant traffic and weather channel. It was a little behind on reporting a jam (in which we sat!), so we flipped to LA's AM 1070. Nonetheless, we greatly appreciate XM's efforts to make our \$10 a month a better value, exactly like we appreciate Dish Network for improving our options on satellite TV, and Cox Communications for improving its cable modem/ISP services into our home. In all, we ungrudgingly spend over \$100/month 'staying connected', using the best consumer technology we can find. We seek and consume information daily from the array of sources that serves us best, including AM, FM and XM.

We would like to comment on the Nat'l Assoc of Broadcasters petition 04-160, in which a few ground-based broadcasters (who together own nearly all of the 'local' stations) wish to prevent us from receiving local information via this latest medium, satellite radio. In what way is local content anyone's private property, if independently collected and reported? Do the ground-based broadcasters plan on going after the traffic and weather *websites* that I use each day, too?

We respectfully request that the FCC reject the NAB's petition 04-160, and continue to support our privilege to pay for the radio services we desire by listening to commercials, and/or by monthly subscription fees. We are proud to live in one of the first nations and cities where this option exists. Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely yours,

Tamara J Stevens
Todd Rubano
Escondido, CA (San Diego)